

A NORTHERN NONCONFORMIST : REV. RODERICK MACKENZIE OF AVOCH

BY THE REV. PRINCIPAL J. MACLEOD, D.D.

THIS title might be a very unwelcome one to the man to whom it is here given and yet for the last score of years of his ministry he was a Non-conformist to the State Church. He was one of the Conforming Episcopal clergy who survived the Revolution Settlement, and who by remaining what they had been before that event ceased to be Conformists. Before that turn in public affairs about half of his ministerial life was lived, so that from 1668 to 1690 he was a minister of the State Church, while from 1690 until his death in 1710 he continued to hold his church and benefice as an Episcopalian outside the National Establishment. In this last respect he was in the same situation as quite a number of his old clerical neighbours, for they too remained Episcopal in profession and yet retained to the last their parishes and their congregations. This was due largely to the feudal influence of the local landed magnates, which counted for much in those days.

Mr Roderick Mackenzie of Avoch lived in the region over which the influence of his chief was paramount, and the politics of the Seaforth family were of a decidedly Jacobite complexion. So also were those of the Earl of Cromartie, the second luminary of the Mackenzie clan, who was the "cousin german," as we learn, of our Nonconformist. It was not for a number of years after the death of Mr Roderick Mackenzie that the Episcopacy for which he stood lost much ground in the South East of the county of Ross or, for that matter, on the West Coast of that county, when Presbyterian ministers long went by the name of The Whig Ministers. Indeed when a full half-century had passed after 1710 we find that in the course of one of his Episcopal visitations the Non-juring Bishop Robert Forbes confirmed as many as four hundred in the short distance that lies between Fortrose in the Black Isle and the river Conon. In the days of his Nonconformity Mr Mackenzie had his parishioners as a body at his back, and it was only with considerable difficulty that the restored Presbyterian Church could effect a settlement of the Parish of Avoch after his death. Yet by the time of Bishop Forbes' visitation, though in the Black Isle the Episcopal communion had such a following still, a great change had come over Avoch. It had become Presbyterian

and that to such a degree that there were in the Parish a few old school Presbyterians who as religious conservatives had cast in their lot with the Secession and were Antiburghers ; and that in those days meant that their outlook and their sympathies were at the antipodes to those of the Erastian Prelatic school of ecclesiastical conviction to which their former Nonconforming minister belonged.

In regard to this Episcopal minister of Avoch there is a pamphlet still extant which seems to have escaped the notice of those who furnished the information that is given in the *Fasti*. This document runs to sixty-four pages of small quarto. It was published in the year 1711 by James Watson of Edinburgh, who went by the nickname of the Popish printer, and who in the later years of the reign of Queen Anne did a good deal of printing for the Government of the day and for the Non-juring party. This pamphlet is an anonymous one. It bears the title : " The Countryman's Idea of a Gospel Minister held forth in the following Preface and Funeral Oration on the Death of that faithful Minister of Christ, Mr Roderick Mackenzie of Avoch in the County of Ross in Scotland, who died the seventeenth day of March MDCCX." Not only does the writer of the account of Mr Mackenzie and of his father in the *Fasti* seem not to have known this pamphlet, but he has made several statements in regard to their careers that the contemporary information supplied in its pages seems to correct.

There is a copy of this old document in the National Library of Scotland. This finds a niche in the Dictionary of Anonymous Literature by Halkett and Laing. They ascribe it to Robert Calder as author. He was a well known Jacobite controversialist whom his opponents spoke of as Curate Calder. In this ascription Halkett and Laing are wrong. For the writer speaks of himself in more than one place as one of the laity : and this is hardly what Robert Calder is likely to have done. Besides he seems quite to enjoy the role that he fills when he lays down the law to the clergy and sets the subject of his eulogy before them as a pattern. Then again the candour with which the writer treats the Scottish Bishops of the second Stuart Episcopacy is not what one would expect from such a party man as Calder was. It certainly belongs to the period of his militant pamphleteering activity ; but its whole outlook, while it is that of a confirmed Episcopalian and Erastian, is that of a man whose sympathies lay rather with that wing of the Established Episcopal Church to which Robert Leighton and Laurence Charteris belonged. If Simon Mackenzie of Allangrange outlived his clerical clansman of Avoch one might venture to suggest his name as the anonymous author. Perhaps in one respect this is not so likely. Allangrange paid more attention to his sentences than did the pamphleteer.

Yet from the ecclesiastical portion of his elaborate argument in favour of the Union between Scotland and England which he published in 1704 under the title : “ *Vis Unita Fortior*,” it is easy to see how much he was of one mind with the writer of “ *The Countryman’s Idea*, etc.” This, however, is only a conjecture, though it is not an unlikely one in view of the evidently intimate acquaintance that the writer had with the subject of his panegyric, with his family connections, and with the district in which his charge lay. Allangrange is only a few miles away from Avoch. Whoever the writer may have been, he claims to have had personal knowledge of Mr Charteris and to have got from him some of the information that he gives. The somewhat pedantic display of acquaintance with the Fathers, the Classics, and the Schoolmen which we have in “ *The Preface and Funeral Oration* ” would quite fit in with the character of Simon Mackenzie’s work. This vein of writing, however, is common to those who followed the lead of the Court preachers of the Anglican Church in the Stuart days. There are references to Gregory the Great, to Bernard, to Aquinas, to Augustine, to Ambrose, to Anselm, to Chrysostom. Then there is reference to the Council of Trent, to the Spanish Bishop, Bartholomew, a Martyribus who preached before that Council, to A Kempis, to Cardinals Bona and Borromeo, to Goddeau and Malebranche, as if they did some things better in France and in the Roman Church. This would be quite in keeping with the traditions of the Old Alliance and with the deference that courtly Anglicanism paid to the Gallican Church. But there are many more references : apart from Continental Reformers and writers like Melancthon, Luther, Calvin, Drusius, Drexelius, Grotius, Bochart, and Arndt, there is a series of classical writers referred to such as Aesop, Epictetus, Aristotle, Seneca, Cicero, Diogenes Laertius, Valerius Maximus, Virgil, Horace, Juvenal, and Caesar. A few Anglican Bishops are spoken of such as Brownrigg, Sanderson, and Wilkins along with George Herbert, nor are Archbishop Leighton and Mr Charteris forgotten. So much for the authorship of the pamphlet which is dedicated to “ *The Distressed Remnant of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland* ” : now for its subject.

From the account given in the Funeral Oration we learn that Mr Roderick Mackenzie, when he died in March, 1710, was seventy-two years old, which would put the date of his birth back to 1637 or 1638. From this we see at once that there is a mistake in the *Fasti* when they tell us that he graduated M.A. at King’s College, Aberdeen, in 1649. Indeed though there is a Roderick Mackenzie on the list of the King’s College graduates for that year it must have been another man altogether. For Roderick Mackenzie, who was minister of Avoch, was a student not at Aberdeen at all, but at St. Andrews. It was there that our pamphlet

tells us he took his course both in Philosophy and in Theology. After he left St. Andrews he studied for some time at Glasgow, where he seems to have entered as a Theological student in March, 1663. From the *Fasti* we learn that he passed his trials for license before the Presbytery of Glasgow and had a testimonial for license of date 1st February, 1655. (1655 is the date given in the new *Fasti*. The first edition is probably right in giving 1665.) Now it looks as though there was something wrong with the date here. For in the year 1655 Mr Mackenzie would be barely seventeen years old, and however precocious he might be it is extremely unlikely, though Andrew Gray of Glasgow is said to have been ordained at the age of nineteen, that he got license as an Expectant at such an early age, and that especially in view of the fact that he came from the North of Scotland. This last circumstance however does not furnish conclusive evidence on the matter as we find from the Oration that its subject was put to school both at Tain and at Fortrose. When he was in the former of these schools we are told that he made such progress in the Hebrew Tongue as it drew the love and affection of his master to him beyond any of his scholars. This master's name was Reid, and he outlived his favourite pupil and was in his later life a Benedictine monk. He had thus early educational advantages in Ross-shire, yet he could hardly become a licentiate for the ministry when only a lad of seventeen.

As Mr Mackenzie's university course was taken at St. Andrews he had as his Professor in Theology Mr Samuel Rutherford. When the Oration mentions this venerable name it is curious to read what his Northern pupil had to say of his Preceptor or rather what his eulogist reports of him. We read in regard to Rutherford: "under whom he profited not much, being he was confused in his notions and method of teaching, applying himself wholly to the writing of books against the Sectaries then most in vogue: of whom he used to tell me in jest, that he was of such a bazar temper, that his very beard pricked up to his lips; yet still said that he was a Person of great Piety, and free of covetousness." The only likeness of Rutherford that is anything like well known represents him as a full-faced, clean-shaven man. Here is a side-light that lets us see him with a beard.

Not only was Mr Roderick Mackenzie a St. Andrews' student; it is possible that his father before him studied at our oldest university. The *Fasti* makes John Mackenzie to have been an Aberdeen graduate of 1631, and for anything we know this may have been the case. But we are not reassured as to the correctness of this account from the conflicting statements that they make about him. They make him to have been married to Christian Wemyss of Lathoker, who is said to have been the daughter of Sir John Wemyss of that place in Fife. The Oration says of this lady that she was of Dr. Weemse of Lathokar's

family in Fife. Now this Dr. Weemse was John by name as was also his father. The statement that she was of Dr. Weemse's family might mean that she was his sister. If so she must have been a good deal younger than the Doctor, who is said to have been fifty-seven years old when he died in 1636 as one of the Prebendaries of Durham, while her son, Roderick, was born according to the calculation justified by the pamphlet in 1637 or 1638. Dr. Weemse, whose collected works appeared in four volumes about the time of his death, was one of the most learned of the Scottish ministry who conformed to the royal pleasure in Church matters. Whether Roderick Mackenzie was his nephew or his grandson the connection that he had with Lathoker made him as his eulogist says to have been almost at home in Fife, and this connection with the Wemyss family would point to his father's university training as having taken place at St. Andrews.

We have said that the Fasti make conflicting statements about Mr Roderick's father. One of these is in regard to his wife. They represent him as having been married to Christian Baillie, daughter of Baillie of Dunain, with issue, Roderick, minister of Avoch. The father may have been married twice, and in each case Christian may have been his wife's name. Each, however, of these wives could not have been the mother of Roderick, and the account which they give of him as the son of Christian Wemyss is borne out by the evidence of our pamphlet. Now on page 11 the Fasti tell us that John Mackenzie of Killearnan, the Archdeacon of Ross, was the natural son of Sir Roderick Mackenzie of Coigach, Tutor of Kintail. It is this account that is right in giving correctly the fact that his wife, the mother of the minister of Avoch, was of the Wemyss family of Lathoker. There is a presumption that it is right when it tells who the Archdeacon's father was. But in another article dealing with this same John Mackenzie, on page 36, they tell us that he was the son of William Mackenzie of Tarrel, minister of Tarbat, who was the son of Hector Mackenzie, who was in turn the son of Rorie Mor Mackenzie of Achiltie. Now John Mackenzie, the father of Roderick, seems to have died in Tarrel, and the Fasti tell us on page 11 that he had a son James who lived in Meikle Tarrel, so that he may have been a near relative of Mr William Mackenzie of Tarrel, the minister of Tarbat, who was his predecessor in the charge of that Parish. This William is said to have had a son John who was minister of Fodderty, and this may have been the successor of Mr Roderick's father, for he was a John Mackenzie too, and he was minister of Fodderty from 1666 to 1721. This second John Mackenzie of Fodderty became also Archdeacon of Ross, and like his clansman of Avoch he "sat tight" at the Revolution, and survived until 1721 as the Episcopal incumbent of his Parish. As the accounts

then of John, the father of the minister of Avoch, are so conflicting, they may be wrong in making him a graduate of Aberdeen.

Ere we pass from the father who was minister of Urray and Suddie and Tarbat and Killearnan and Fodderty we note that the Funeral Oration on his son talks about him that he showed his zeal and courage in "that in anno 1648" (such is the date given, obviously an error for 1638) "in Face of the Assembly at Glasgow, he openly protested against these Proceedings as being derogatory to the Crown and to the Canons of the Church; which occasioned such heat that His Majesty's Commissioner (The Marquis of Hamilton) was forced to send his own horses to carry him off in the night-time to Portpatrick, from which place he went to Ireland, where he preached to the approbation of all that heard him, till the unhappy Rebellion broke out there when he was fain to return home; and lived to the dawning of the Restauration." Now the Fasti tell us that he was deposed in 1639 for opposing the Covenant and obliged to flee to England and afterward to Ireland. This seems to be an imperfect echo of what the Oration has told us about him. The flight was first to Ireland. But the Oration itself which makes him to have been a protester at the Glasgow Assembly may be at fault, as John Mackenzie was not at that Assembly as representative of his Presbytery of Dingwall. The Presbytery sent another Mackenzie as a Commissioner to the Assembly, Murdoch Mackenzie of Contin. This Murdoch was afterwards minister of Inverness and Elgin, Bishop of Moray and then of Orkney. Yet John, the minister then of Urray, may have been present and have uttered his protest in a quite irregular way as one of the general public. If he did so it would have been at an early stage in the proceedings, as it was only in the early part of the Assembly that Hamilton was present at it as the King's Commissioner, for he left the Assembly when he could not carry out his sovereign's instructions and policy. This Assembly met at the very end of the year 1638, so that John Mackenzie's deposition for his venturesome escapade would not take place before 1639, in which year the Fasti put it. His irregular protest would be, perhaps with other things, the opposition to the Covenant for which he was deposed.

John Mackenzie was reponed by his Synod in 1643, and on this occasion it seems evident that he must have taken the Covenant. He was settled in 1644 at Suddie which was then a Parish by itself, but is now part of that of Knockbain; and in the following year he became the minister of Tarbat, where he succeeded Mr William Mackenzie whom the Fasti, as we have seen assigned him (page 36) as his father. It is just possible, though not at all likely, that Mr William was his step-father. By the way, the statement that this Mr William was educated at King's College, Aberdeen, and was a graduate, is not borne out by P. J. Anderson's

Roll of the Alumni of King's College, as in that Roll there is no William Mackenzie whose date would fit in with the dates that the Fasti give in regard to this minister of Tarbet. For the first Alumnus of King's College of this name matriculated only in 1627, while the record of Mr William of Tarbat shows him to have been admitted minister of Kilmorack about 1624. However that may be, when John Mackenzie was minister of Tarbet he signalled his loyalty as a clansman to his chief by refusing to read to his people "the Declaration of the Commission of Assembly of Dec. 1645 against the Remonstrance unless the Assembly ordered him, the said Declaration being against his chief, George, Earl of Seaforth." (Fasti, p. 75.) This militant churchman found it hard to keep out of either difficulties or mischief. For he was entangled in an adultery case which issued in his deposition for a second time. He seems to have spent about ten years before 1660 out of the ministry. But with the Restoration he was restored to his "Churches"—such is the word in the Oration, not Church but Churches—and it looks as if he was the pluralist minister of Killearnan and Fodderty in spite of the fact that the two Parishes are not contiguous, for Ferintosh and Urray lie between them. At any rate the Fasti make him minister of Killearnan in 1662 as well as of Fodderty in the same year. This fits in with the plural "Churches" in the account of his restoration in his son's Funeral Oration. At Fodderty Roderick, his son, acted as his assistant. For we learn from the Fasti account of an Episcopal visitation of Fodderty on August 9th, 1665, that the Communion had not been observed in the Parish "these twelve years bygone." This information is drawn from the minutes of the Presbytery of Dingwall as they appear in Dr. William Mackay's Inverness and Dingwall Presbytery Records 1643-88 (Vol. 24 of the First Series of the Scottish History Society). When this visitation was held the Archdeacon was not present and there was no excuse given for his absence. The parishioners, it comes out, had not all been examined, though the minute bears (Mackay's Records, p. 312) that "Mr Roderick Mackenzie, sone to the said Archdeacon, did sometymes preach and catechise." It looks as though his father was in ill-health, for he died the following year, 1666. If the Fasti date (page 36) for his birth is right he cannot have been much more than fifty when he died. Yet the Oration (p. 56) speaks of his son as having come "Home to Ross to assist his old Father, who upon the King's Restauration was restored to his own churches again." A man who had just turned fifty, if indeed he had reached it in 1662, could hardly be spoken of as old. There may be a mistake in the date suggested for the Archdeacon's birth.

Having said so much about his father we may now turn to the information our pamphlet supplies about Mr Roderick Mackenzie himself. He was not only the minister of Avoch, but one of the Heritors of the

Parish. This latter position may have been his through his wife who was of the family of Rosehaugh, being the sister of Sir George Mackenzie who owned land in Avoch. This brother-in-law was the talented and unscrupulous tool of Stuart tyranny who earned for himself the unenviable name of "Bloody Mackenzie." He was Lord Advocate in the days of Charles II and his brother James. It is singular to find that the brother-in-law of Rosehaugh was one of the Conforming ministry—when the State Church—was Episcopal who were most disposed to be friendly to the suffering Presbyterians. He was quite a convinced Erastian and Episcopalian yet he was on good terms with some of the Northern ministry who had to suffer for their Presbyterian principles. For example, two of his attached friends were James Fraser of Brea who served a term of imprisonment on the Bass Rock, and Hugh Anderson who was ousted from the charge of Cromarty yet lived to be reinstated there after the Revolution took place. Mr Mackenzie, we are told, never had a quarrel with any but on the account of some immorality or vice, and he was one of "such a Gospel Temper as not to be at Ease till first he was reconciled with any he thought he had offended." "This," says the writer, "is a Lesson worthy the imitation of all Mackenzies. And to those from whom he differed he was affable and discreet, kind and charitable. His correspondence with the Reverend Fraser of Brea, and Mr Hugh Anderson of Cromarty, and their mutual endearing embraces at meeting, was no small Proof of it."

Mr Mackenzie was an unusual specimen of the Nonconformists in the line that he took with regard to oaths that were imposed on Churchmen by civil Authority. He felt that these tended to debauch their minds. He himself had serious misgivings about taking the Test in the latter part of the reign of Charles II. Indeed when the Fasti show a second Roderick Mackenzie as minister of Avoch from 1683 this may be owing to a break in his incumbency due to those difficulties. For our pamphlet tells us that the Oath of the Test which, by the way, Laurence Charteris refused to take—"caused so much Distraction of Thought in him that 'twas needless to bid him take any after that." He "blessed God that sent Dr. Young, then Bishop of Ross, to be his Ordinary in clearing him of his Doubts . . . He sadly lamented the frequent Imposition of Oaths that occasioned so much Perjury in the Nation to the debauching People's Consciences." He thought as he told the writer of the Funeral Discourse that "public Oaths did not so much concern private Persons (that were bound to obey the present Laws) as it did the Ministers of State that invent them if they did not clash with former oaths and that Dr. Sanderson was of this opinion." These were the opinions of one who "feared that Popery would be ushered in by our Divisions and that we were more

zealous for Models and Forms of Churchmen than for true Religion and the true Protestant Interest, which troubled him more than all the harassings and citations he got to appear before the Privy Council after the Revolution, where he said he found more Favour than he expected, and had both ministers and others even of the other sex of the contrary Persuasion interceding for him."

Mr Mackenzie's eulogist and friend gives him a high character for piety and kindness and for diligence in doing the work of his own profession. He was careful as to family worship and saw to the instruction of his children and servants. Each morning and evening he had a bell rung in the churchyard that people might come to church in a decent manner. In those daily exercises he seems to have used Dr. Patrick's Devotions. Yet when extraordinary occasions offered he made use of his own extemporaneous gift as on Fast days and the like. A highly flattering account is given of the measure of success that he met with in the work of his charge. When he assisted his father in Fodderty he had to use the Gaelic, or, as he calls it, the Irish language. His estimate of it would hardly appeal to the enthusiasts who are working for a revival of the old language. Indeed in this he was of very much the same mind as the Highland Episcopal party. After they had long been in the habit of using the English Prayer Book it was not published in Gaelic until 1794, and for the Metrical Gaelic Psalms they have simply borrowed the version of their Presbyterian neighbours. Mr Mackenzie's estimate of his native Gaelic was more outspoken, than fair for he held that this "barbarous tongue was an inlet to two great vices, to wit that of thieving and swearing which were inconsistent with the Gospel Spirit." His admiring friend who puts this judgment on record seems to have been of one mind with him for he goes on to say, "And I am sorry to say his observation proved too true all his time."

In Avoch Mr Roderick did not need to carry on a bilingual ministry. When he was settled there he found things in sad disorder, "the people in perfect Ignorance so that there was not a Bible to be seen in the Church, but what Two Gentlemen and their Ladies had." Yet in a few years he wrought a remarkable reformation among the people so that the Word of God was universally read in the Parish. This points to a good school where the congregation learned to read. And in the space of twenty years or so he banished not only their old profane customs but the "very jargon of language which made them a ridicule to all that heard them." "Now," says the historian, "they are the best taught and best disciplined of any Parish in the Nation. The very herds have now all the Psalms of David by heart, their Catechisms of all sorts and large Portions of the Scriptures for building them up in their holy Faith." To bring

this about he employed a Catechist at his own expense who taught from house to house, and he himself saw to the personal examination of the young folk in the Church at the beginning of each quarter. By the way, he seems to have used the Westminster Catechism as he no doubt used the Scottish Metrical Psalms.

Not only was Mr Mackenzie careful about the instruction of his people ; he is said to have prayed all his sermons on his knees before he preached them. He observed the Lord's Supper twice a year at Easter and Lammas. In connection with that service he preached a thanksgiving sermon on the Mondays after the celebration of the Sacrament. When he began this practice his Bishop took exception to it on the ground that it was a Presbyterian custom. But he stood his ground and the custom took root in the Diocese of Ross and in a few years became universal through his example. In his own life he was so strict that he might vie with any of the saints in the Roman Calendar. He observed strict discipline so that he was branded with being a Presbyterian, "as if, forsooth," says his eulogist, "none could be strict in these duties but they." When he had occasion to visit Edinburgh he came home, not "with powdered wigs and sweet gloves, with a silk cassock or a surcingle, but with his cloak-bag full of Bibles, Catechisms and other devotional works" for his people's use.

This charitable and zealous clergyman is described as truly orthodox yet he was only a moderate Calvinist. But he was as sound a Protestant as was in the Church. He spent every farthing of his ministerial income on charitable uses and was so diligent and industrious as to maintain his large family handsomely while he was able to build a good large stone bridge on the Water of Avoch and made his church the most beautiful little country church in the North of Scotland. He left a considerable sum in land and money for the poor of the Parish and appointed trustees to administer it. In his conduct of public worship he practised the small details in which in his days the worship of the Conformist Episcopalian differed from their Presbyterian neighbours. He concluded his prayers with the Lord's Prayer. It is told of him also that he taught his people to give up the slovenly custom of sitting in time of prayer. This points in the direction of proving that their Church was provided with seats, a thing that was by no means universal in those days. Sitting at prayer must have crept in before his time. He insisted that standing or kneeling is the appropriate posture of those who engage in this service. As might be expected in the case of a Conformist to the Episcopacy of his early ministry in the State Church he not only used the Lord's Prayer, but had the doxology sung. Thus he was a Conformist to the recognised Episcopal pattern of service which prevailed from 1662 to 1690 in those two features of their public worship in which they differed from subse-

quent Presbyterian usage. For it was after the restoration of Presbyterianism in 1690 that those who adhered to Episcopacy in Church Government began to adopt a markedly liturgical type of public worship. The defence of the use of the Doxology by Robert Edward of Murroes, which saw the light in 1683 and was reissued in 1731, shows that the writer and his fellow-Conformists were on the defensive. And the weight that Edward attached to the findings of the General Assemblies of the Church at the epoch of the Westminster Assembly shows what a curious type of Episcopacy prevailed under the late Stuarts. To say the least it was very different from the type that developed in Scotland in the years that followed the Revolution. A writer like Edward recognised the continuity of his Church with that of the Second Reformation in regard to whose true Presbyterian character there did not need to be any manner of doubt.

While Mr Mackenzie was a zealous Conformist to the accepted Government and worship of the Episcopal establishment he held himself free to form his own judgment of the Bench of Bishops. In this respect the author of his Funeral Oration was of one mind with him. His censure of the Stuart Bishops was not due to any lack of opportunity to be a Bishop himself. He was thrice offered a Bishopric and refused it. This refusal seems to have been due to two things. One of these was his feeling of how weighty the burden of the office was : and he remembered the saying of Chrysostom that it is a wonder if a Bishop can be saved. The other was that he felt knit to the Church to which he was first betrothed, and feeling how much Bishops as an order were contemned in Scotland he concluded that he could do no good in such an office. Besides, as his eulogist tells us, " the Bishops' ordinary conversation at that time was not so savoury to him as he expected and (he) told me that it was no wonder that Archbishop Leighton demitted his charge and left the Nation for they were not worthy of him. He found fault with them for going too often to Court, and fawning upon Statesmen especially if they were their Patrons and Fauters." Indeed on this matter the writer of the pamphlet is quite as emphatic as the subject of his eulogy, for we find that on page 23 he says of the Bishops : " How did they brigue for Preferments at Court, and become Tools to the ambitious Designs of Great Men ? And when they got once in, how did they hector and domineer over their Clergy in their Synods and Assemblies, and called everything Presbyterian that looked like Piety and Strictness of Living ? So as Holy *Bernard's* Complaint might be literally taken up against them : Non Prelati sed Pilati, non praecones sed praedones invadunt Ecclesiam. How little conscience made they of residing in their Diocese, of visiting them at set times of the year, of ordering their Clergy ; or yet of admitting

young men to Holy Orders contrary to St. Paul's rule to Timothy ? " And again, on page 24 he says : " Have they been seen in riotous companies without checking them or themselves, nay running to the same Excess of Riot ; so that it was not without Ground that Heavenly Archbishop Leighton wished, That he with the other Twelve were cast into the River of Forth with a mill-stone round their necks, as a no less Heavenly Soul told me from his Mouth." (Mr Charters.) Such words make it clear that the writer was one of the school of Leighton and Charteris.

At the same time as the author of the Funeral Oration is so candid and outspoken in his words of criticism he makes it clear that he was strongly Episcopal in his judgment. For he speaks in highly laudatory terms of the meteoric work of Dr. Sacheverell. He compares him indeed to Martin Luther. In his eyes he is a second Reformer. And one without forcing can read between the lines that he and those who thought with him were looking forward to an early restoration of Episcopacy in Scotland. This was to be under the auspices of Queen Anne as the outcome of the recent Union with England. Here was one of the very things for which Simon Mackenzie of Allangrange argued seven years before. It was among other things with a view to such a restoration of the Bishops that he sought a Union of the two Parliaments. Thus if he was not the author of this pamphlet it came from the pen of another of the same way of thinking. And it appeared during the time when the influence of the Anglican High Church party told on the Parliament in London. Here is some of the language which according to its dedication was addressed to " The Distressed Remnant of the Episcopal Clergy in Scotland " : " How great reason have ye now to bless God that He begins to deal more bountiful with you and make the days of Refreshment dawn in your Horizon ? That you have not a Jezebel to tyrannize over you but a Deborah to be a nursing Mother to the Church ? Pray then that God may give our Gracious Queen the Spirit of Wisdom and Understanding for discharging the great Trust committed to her ; and to put in Her Heart and the States of Parliament, to restore the comely Beauty of Order to this distressed Church and Nation : Then the Union, so happily begun and preached in by Her Majesty, shall be accomplished to the Satisfaction of *Great Britain* : Then *Christ's* seamless coat will suffer no more Rents, nor yet be party-colour'd, as it is at present." What was aimed at is obvious.

A list of " The Distressed Remnant " who subsequent to the Revolution Settlement held Parishes in Scotland either as incumbents or as intruders is given in Defoe's pamphlet—" Presbyterian Persecution "—published in 1707. There are well over a hundred and fifty names given and the list closes with the words, " and many more." These had not

taken the Oath of Allegiance to William and Mary or even to Anne. This party had been reckoning on the success of their Jacobite policy with the backing of Louis XIV of France. But the military successes of Marlborough had upset their calculations. They were now reckoning on the success of the reaction in England from the Revolution with Queen Anne as its leader or figurehead.

The pamphlet on which we have drawn so freely is plainly a very significant document. It gives quite a number of curious pieces of information. The man to whose memory it is devoted was evidently a man of considerable independence of judgment and courage. He protested vigorously against The Ecclesiastical Commission for the North in 1694. Yet he did not turn a blind eye to what he looked upon as blemishes on his Episcopal system. Here are his sentiments on one of these as we have them on page 59: "And for the *congé d'élire* he could not away with at all, that the chapter should meet and invoke the holy Ghost, to choose a fit Person, that was already chosen to their Hand, was to mock the blessed Spirit, and so Episcopacy could not have good success in this Nation: whereas had there been Two or Three of the best of the Clergy in a Diocese sent by general approbation in Leet to the Court, a *congé d'élire* for one of them had not been so blameworthy. And I mind, at the late Bishop of Ross's Election, he left the Chapter that Day (tho' Chantour) and went with a Friend to Murray in a very foul Day, declaring he could not be witness to the mocking the Holy Ghost at that Rate, and said that Matthias got no *eongé d'élire*, nor any Bishop, for the first 400 years after him." We have here a singular Conformist who had in him the making of a stout Nonconformist.

Macfarlane's Genealogical Collections confirm the view that the first Archdeacon John Mackenzie was not the son of Mr William Mackenzie of Tarbat, and that the second Archdeacon of that name was his son. The Pamphlet in speaking of Mr Roderick's Catechist in Avoch mentions that he was other than the ordinary Reader. The practice of having an elder to read the Scriptures while the congregation was gathering survived till less than twenty years ago in one or two of the Ross-shire Free Churches. Dr. Aird of Creich had the old Presbyterian tradition that two of "The Curates" were godly ministers. One was minister of Ferintosh. The other may well have been Mr Roderick Mackenzie of Avoch. Roderick Mackenzie matriculated at St. Andrews 4th February, 1657, and at Glasgow in March, 1663. A John Mackenzie, a native of Ross-shire, matriculated at St. Mary's, St. Andrews, 20th January, 1627. He is entered as a Master.